

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the non-final Office Action dated June 21, 2006. The present Amendment amends claims 1 and 3 in order to further clarify a portion of the scope sought to be patented, and otherwise disputes certain findings of fact made in connection with the rejection of the claims. Support for these amendments can be found variously throughout the specification, including, for example, original claims 1 and 3. No new matter has been added.

Accordingly, claims 1 to 8 are presently pending in the application, each of which is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the present Amendment and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Information Disclosure Statement

It is also noted with appreciation that the Information Disclosure Statement filed on March 29, 2006 has been considered by the Examiner.

Specification & Abstract

The Specification and Abstract have been reviewed to update the disclosure of the Specification Abstract in light of revisions to the claims. Entry of these changes, involving minor matters not involving new matter, is respectfully solicited.

Claim Objections

The Applicant thanks the examiner for a thorough reading of the claims. In accordance with the examiner's suggestion, claim 3 has been amended to correct minor informalities. Withdrawal of the objections to claims 3 and 7 is therefore courteously solicited.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Action, claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,942,922 to Nishiguchi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,734,260 to

Nishiguchi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,761,973 to Nishiguchi et al., and U.S. Patent No. 6,680,122 to Shigeo et al., each in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,355,351 to Sawada et al.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,660,385 to Nishiguchi et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,355,351 to Sawada et al.

Claims 1-8 were further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over European Publication No. EP 1314768 to Shigeo et al., Japanese Publication No. JP 2003-306636 to Nishiguchi et al., Japanese Publication No. JP 2003-221547 to Nishiguchi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,503,629 to Nishiguchi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,492,027 to Nishiguchi et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0119318 to Shigeo et al., European Publication No. EP 1111013 to Shigeo et al., Japanese Publication No. JP 2002-060454 to Nishiguchi et al., and Japanese Publication no. JP 2001-279168 to Nishiguchi et al., each in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,355,351 to Sawada et al.

Finally, claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0068172 to Nishiguchi et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,355,351 to Sawada et al.

The Federal Circuit has stated that the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. *See, e.g., In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974); *accord.* MPEP 2143.03.

Claim 1 has been amended to delete molybdate salt compounds from the list of claimed corrosion inhibitors.

As conceded in the Office Action, each of the above references fails to disclose, teach, or even suggest *a coating composition used for coating of a steel material and/or aluminum material, comprising at least one corrosion inhibitor selected from corrosion inhibitors of cerium compounds, lanthanum compounds, gluconic acid derivative salts, porous base materials, triazole compounds, thiazole compounds, tetracyclines, and metal phosphate salt compounds of ascorbic acid.*

Accordingly, because each of the references cited in the above rejections, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 1, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully

requested. *See, e.g., In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974); *accord.* MPEP 2143.03.

Moreover, aside from the novel limitations recited therein, claims 2-8, being dependent either directly or indirectly upon allowable base claim 1, are also allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. Withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is therefore courteously solicited.


CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. KPC-0307 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: September 21, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Christopher J. Wickstrom

Registration No.: 57,199

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

1233 20th Street, N.W.

Suite 501

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 955-3750